



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – PROCESS EVALUATION

Disproportionate Minority Contact
Enhanced Technical Assistance Project
September 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: GRANT AWARD OPPORTUNITY AND PURPOSE

SECTION II: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SECTION III: GRANT ELIGIBILITY AND SCOPE OF WORK REQUIREMENTS

SECTION IV: PROPOSAL COMPONENTS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

SECTION V: PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS AND RATING CRITERIA

SECTION VI: NEW GRANTEE BRIEFING

SECTION VII: KEY DATES AND CONTACT INFORMATION

APPENDICES

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Proposal Rating Criteria

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
PROCESS EVALUATION
DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT**

SECTION I: GRANT AWARD OPPORTUNITY AND PURPOSE

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is issuing this Request for Proposals (RFP) for a **process evaluation** of the Enhanced Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Technical Assistance Project (TAP). Based on recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency's DMC Subcommittee, which guided development of the RFP, the CSA Board will award a grant of up to \$200,000 in available federal funds for a two-year grant period that will begin January 1, 2008. The purpose of the process evaluation is to assist the CSA in planning future DMC activities by identifying the operational strengths and limitations of the first two phases of the Enhanced DMC TAP, both of which represent a pioneering approach to addressing DMC. The CSA is interested in learning what worked and what did not by understanding the environments in which required activities were implemented, the processes used to implement these activities, and the impact of program fidelity/operations on desired outcomes. The process evaluation design must address these stated goals and must include the five counties participating in the first and second phases of the Enhanced DMC TAP.

SECTION II: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The CSA is the agency responsible for administering California's Title II Formula Grant award, which supports state and local delinquency prevention/intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvements. To receive a Formula Grant award, states must comply with four core requirements of the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. One of these requirements is that states must demonstrate a good faith effort to address DMC – i.e., the overrepresentation of minority youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system (at all points, from arrest through confinement) relative to their numbers in the general population.

Enhanced DMC TAP: In 2006, the CSA issued a competitive RFP process for the Enhanced DMC TAP, a three-year initiative designed to assist probation departments in understanding and identifying DMC and to equip these agencies with the resources needed to provide leadership in developing or strengthening the foundation for community-based DMC reduction activities. The three 12-month phases of the Enhanced DMC TAP are described below.

- **Phase 1 - DMC Infrastructure and Education**

This phase is designed to address the identified infrastructure needs within the probation department. Funds are earmarked for hiring DMC staff and/or securing the tools needed to implement or improve data collection and analysis efforts, and for contracting with an expert consultant to conduct probation staff training sessions on DMC and assist with data analysis.

Grant Period: January 1 through December 31, 2007.

Grant Award: Up to \$150,000 for each county selected through the competitive RFP process.

In November 2006, the CSA Board awarded grants totaling nearly \$750,000 to Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Diego and Santa Cruz Counties for Phase 1 of the Enhanced DMC TAP. Project descriptions are available on the CSA's [DMC Home Page](#).

- **Phase 2 - Stakeholder Collaboration and Plan Development**

This phase is designed to support the education of juvenile justice system stakeholders (e.g., judges, district attorneys, public defenders, local law enforcement, social service and education agencies, and community-based organizations) about the probation department's DMC efforts and to engage stakeholders in the development of a long-term DMC reduction plan. Funds are earmarked for contracting with an expert consultant to facilitate stakeholder collaboration and to assist in developing DMC reduction strategies. Funds are also available for continued support of DMC staff within the probation department.

Grant Period: January 1 through December 31, 2008

Grant Award: Up to \$175,000 will be awarded to each county that completes Phase 1 and submits an application for second year funding.

- **Phase 3 - Implementation of DMC Reduction Plan**

The purpose of this phase is to support implementation of the DMC reduction plan developed in Phase 2. Grant funds are earmarked for specific activities outlined in the DMC reduction plan (e.g., development of risk assessment tools, cultural awareness/competency training, implementation or expansion of prevention and/or diversion programs for at-risk youth). Funds are also available for continued support of DMC staff.

Grant Period: January 1 through December 31, 2009

Grant Award: Up to \$200,000 will be awarded to each county that completes Phase 2 and submits an application for third and final year funding.

SECTION III: GRANT ELIBILITY AND SCOPE OF WORK REQUIREMENTS

Eligibility: Consistent with federal law governing the expenditure of Title II Formula Grant funds, the CSA will accept grant proposals from public agencies/organizations (including academic institutions), private agencies/organizations (including for-profit and not-for-profit businesses) and individuals. Organizations currently under contract as the expert consultant for counties participating in the Enhanced DMC TAP are eligible to submit a proposal for this grant; however, staff providing technical assistance under that contract may not participate in the process evaluation.

As indicated in this RFP (see Section IV and Appendix B), eligible applicants must demonstrate in the proposal that they are culturally competent. In addition, applicants must demonstrate in the proposal that they possess the following:

1. Past experience in conducting process evaluations; and
2. An understanding of how California's juvenile justice system works, including the linkages among its various stakeholders.

NOTE: Applicants whose proposals include evidence of demonstrated experience on programs and/or activities related to reducing disproportionality/disparity will receive priority consideration (see Section V and Appendix B for more information).

Scope of Work: The contract between the CSA and successful applicant will require the grantee to implement the work plan outlined in the funded proposal; however, as deemed necessary by the CSA's DMC Coordinator, this plan may be changed prior to or during the grant period.

In addition to submitting a final evaluation report, the successful applicant will be required by contract to do the following:

- Meet with the CSA's DMC Coordinator for a grantee briefing session (see Section VI for more information) and upon request.
- Present updates on the process evaluation, as requested, to the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency and/or its DMC Subcommittee.
- Submit quarterly progress reports on the status of activities undertaken during the process evaluation (the CSA will provide the format for this report).
- Submit quarterly invoices (disbursement of grant funds occurs on a reimbursement basis for costs incurred during a reporting period) and maintain adequate supporting documentation for all costs claimed on invoices.
- Submit an audit of expenditures, as required under federal law, within 120 days of each 12-month grant period (reasonable and necessary extensions may be granted upon request). Grant funds may not be used for the audits.

SECTION IV: PROPOSAL COMPONENTS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Required Components: Proposals submitted in response to this RFP must include the seven components outlined below. These components must be packaged in the order shown below. Applicants must use a minimum 11-point font, and the proposals must have one inch margins. All narrative sections must be double-spaced and may not exceed the specified page limits.

1. Cover Letter

Include a cover letter signed by the applicant (individual or person authorized to bind the organization/agency to a contract). Address the letter to the attention of Shaline Hunter, DMC Coordinator, Corrections Standards Authority, 600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA 95811.

2. Title Page

The title page must include the following information: 1) The name of the applicant (individual or organization/agency); 2) the applicant's work address, telephone number, fax number and email address; and 3) the date the proposal is submitted.

3. Executive Summary (maximum of two pages)

Provide a concise overview of the applicant's ability to satisfy the requirements of this RFP and highlights of the work plan submitted in response to the RFP.

4. Work Plan (maximum of 20 pages)

- a) Evaluation Design: Describe the components of the proposed process evaluation and explain how they connect to the stated goals of the grant. Describe the types of information that will be collected, from whom the information will be collected and how it will be collected. Explain how the design takes into consideration the dynamics of cultural differences within the grantee agencies, among juvenile justice system stakeholders, and in the community at large. Provide a timeline for evaluation-related activities during the two-year grant period.

NOTE: The proposals submitted by the five counties participating in Phase 1 are available for review at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/CSA/CPP/Grants/DMC-TAP/dmc/dmc_rater_information/dmc_RFPs.html

Under ideal circumstances, a process evaluation would have been initiated when these grants began. Unfortunately, this was not possible, and applicants will need to take this into account in developing their proposal. The proposals for Phase 2 will not be available for review until early January 2008, but CSA staff anticipates that all five counties will receive second year funding. Applicants will need to rely on the information in this RFP and their past experience in proposing evaluation strategies for Phase 2.

- b) Agency/Individual Capacity: Describe the applicant's prior experience in conducting process evaluations (include, if applicable, the experience of subcontractors). Identify personnel who will be included in the scope of work for this grant. Provide their titles, a description of past experience, a summary of duties that would be undertaken on this grant, and evidence of their ability to work in a culturally sensitive, competent manner. Provide evidence that the applicant (and, if applicable, subcontractors) understands how California's juvenile justice system works, including stakeholder interaction. If applicable, describe any past experience on efforts to address disproportionality/disparity (applicant and/or subcontractors).

5. Budget (maximum of three pages)

Budget Line Items: Provide a two-year budget, preferably in a table format and using applicable line items from the CSA's invoice form (Salaries and Benefits, Services and Supplies, Professional Services, Community-Based Organization Contracts, Administrative Overhead, Equipment/Fixed Assets, and Other). The budget may not exceed the amount available for this grant (\$200,000), and Administrative Overhead may not exceed 10 percent of the funds requested. Please refer to the CSA's [Grant Administration and Audit Guide](#) for information on eligible expenditures.

Budget Narrative: Provide details on how grant funds would be expended over the course of the two-year contract (including costs related to ensuring a culturally competent process evaluation) and explain why the proposed budget is reasonable and appropriate given the nature and scope of the Enhanced DMC TAP and evaluation design.

6. References (see Appendix A)

Using the form provided in Appendix A, submit at least one but not more than three references for services the applicant has performed within the last seven years that are similar to the scope of work for this grant.

7. Samples of Prior Work

Provide samples of the applicant's prior work that are pertinent to the scope of work for this grant. For each work product submitted (there is no limit on the number), include a list of the individuals/organizations with whom the applicant worked. Pertinent work products include, but are not limited to, publications, reports, and interview/survey instruments).

Proposal Submission: Proposals are due November 12, 2007. Proposals may be mailed or hand delivered. If mailed, the proposal must be postmarked by midnight November 12, 2007. If hand delivered, the proposals must arrive no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 12, 2007. Late proposals will not be considered.

Applicants must submit one original (marked "Original") and eight (8) copies of the proposal (including all work products submitted as part of the proposal). Mail or deliver proposals to the attention of Shalinee Hunter at the CSA, 600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA 95811.

NOTE: All costs incurred by applicants prior to the contract start date are the sole responsibility of the applicants and may not be charged to the grant.

SECTION V: PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS AND RATING CRITERIA

Technical Compliance Review: CSA staff will review each proposal to determine if it meets the RFP requirements. In order to avoid having otherwise worthy proposals eliminated from consideration due to relatively minor errors (e.g., mathematical errors), applicants will have an opportunity to respond to deficiencies identified during this review process, which will take place November 13-14, 2007, and to make non-substantive changes that would bring the proposal into technical compliance. CSA staff will also contact references furnished with the proposal.

Merit Review: The DMC Subcommittee, which is comprised of juvenile justice practitioners and other subject matter experts, will evaluate the merits of the proposals in accordance with the rating criteria approved by the CSA Board (**see Appendix B**). The CSA will not award a grant unless an applicant achieves a minimum score of 57. Applicants will be notified by CSA staff about the results of the rating panel's evaluation of the proposals. The panel will develop funding recommendations for consideration by the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency (ACJJD). The CSA Board will make the final grant award decision in December 2007.

SECTION VI: GRANTEE BRIEFING SESSION

The DMC Coordinator will conduct a mandatory briefing session with the successful applicant on January 8, 2008 (travel costs are reimbursable from the grant). The purpose of this grantee briefing session is two-fold: 1) share information about the contract development process, on-line invoicing and budget modification systems, and other grant management and monitoring activities; and 2) discuss the work plan for the process evaluation (county applications for Phase 2 will be made available prior to this briefing).

SECTION VII: KEY DATES AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Proposal Due to the CSA	November 12, 2007
Technical Compliance Review	November 13-14, 2007
Merit Review	Nov. 15-Dec. 3, 2007
ACJJD Review and Recommendation	December 12, 2007
Grant Awarded by CSA Board	December 2007 (Date TBD)
Contract Start Date	January 1, 2008
Grantee Briefing Session	January 8, 2008

Questions about this RFP should be directed to Shalinee Hunter, DMC Coordinator, at (916) 322-8081 or shalinee.hunter@cdcr.ca.gov.

APPENDIX A References

List below at least one and up to three references for services performed by the applicant within the last seven (7) years that are similar to the Scope of Work for this grant award.

REFERENCE 1

Name of Agency/Firm

Street Address

City

State

Zip Code

Contact Person/Title

Telephone Number

E-Mail Address

Dates of Service(s)

Value or Cost of Service(s)

Brief Description of Service(s) Provided

REFERENCE 2

Name of Agency/Firm

Street Address

City

State

Zip Code

Contact Person/Title

Telephone Number

E-Mail Address

Dates of Service(s)

Value or Cost of Service(s)

Brief Description of Service(s) Provided

REFERENCE 3

Name of Agency/Firm

Street Address

City

State

Zip Code

Contact Person/Title

Telephone Number

E-Mail Address

Dates of Service(s)

Value or Cost of Service(s)

Brief Description of Service(s) Provided

APPENDIX B
Proposal Rating Criteria

MERIT REVIEW RATING FACTOR	MAXIMUM POINTS
Evaluation Design: The proposal clearly describes the components of the process evaluation and demonstrates a convincing nexus between those components and the grant's stated purpose and goals. The proposal clearly describes what kinds of information would be collected, from whom it would be collected, and how it would be collected. The methodology is appropriate and reflects cultural competence. The evaluation design is appropriate given the nature and scope of the Enhanced DMC TAP. The timeline is appropriate given the evaluation design and scope of work.	55
Agency/Individual Capacity: The proposal clearly describes relevant experience in conducting process evaluations. The proposal clearly identifies the personnel who will perform grant-related activities and what their responsibilities will be. The proposal clearly describes the project staff's relevant past experience and includes sufficient evidence of their cultural awareness and competency. The proposal includes sufficient evidence to determine that the applicant understands how California's juvenile justice system works, including stakeholder interaction.	45
Budget Appropriateness: The proposal provides sufficient detail to assess how grant funds would be spent and the budget incorporates expenditures for ensuring a culturally competent process evaluation. The proposed budget is reasonable and appropriate given the nature and scope of both the Enhanced DMC TAP and process evaluation design.	30
Probability of Success: The reference(s) and work products provide compelling evidence of the applicant's cultural competency and past success in conducting work similar in scope and nature to the process evaluation for the Enhanced DMC Technical Assistance Project.	30
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS (without priority consideration)	160
Priority Consideration: The proposal clearly describes relevant past experience on issues related to disproportionality/disparity.	15
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS (with priority consideration)	175